

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 3-4, 6-12 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al. (US Patent N° 6,683,865) (hereinafter Garcia) in view of Ahmed et al. (EP 1137224) (hereinafter Ahmed).

The Applicant has amended Claim 1. More precisely, the Applicant has inserted the limitations “, *further wherein said data identifying said detected neighboring node and said data identifying said given node comprise IP address identification data*”. The Applicant believes that new Claim 1 is fully supported by the disclosure.

The Applicant now claims in Claim 1: “*A method for establishing a communication link from a first processing unit located in a first network to a second processing unit located in a second network, through a wireless network comprising a plurality of nodes, said method comprising:*

*generating a plurality of dynamic routes using each of said plurality of nodes;*

*in a first gateway, selecting one of the plurality of dynamic routes between the nodes to access a second gateway, the first gateway adapted for accessing the wireless network and said first processing unit, the second gateway adapted for accessing the wireless network and said second processing unit; and*

*establishing a tunnel between the first gateway and the second gateway using the selected route to thereby establish said communication link; wherein said generating comprises, for a given node, detecting a neighboring node to said given node, collecting data identifying said detected neighboring node and transmitting to the first gateway said data identifying said detected neighboring node with data identifying said given node to generate said plurality of dynamic routes, further wherein said data identifying said*

*detected neighboring node and said data identifying said given node comprise IP address identification data."*

The Applicant believes that new Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Garcia in view of Ahmed. More precisely, the Applicant believes that the limitation "*further wherein said data identifying said detected neighboring node and said data identifying said given node comprise IP address identification data*" is not suggested by Garcia and/or Ahmed. The Applicant further submits that the Examiner agreed, during a phone interview held on July 30, 2008 that the prior art was overcome by the amendment.

The Applicant therefore believes that Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Garcia in view of Ahmed.

The Applicant believes that Claims 3-4, 6-15 are non-obvious in view of Garcia in view of Ahmed since they are dependent from Claim 1, which is believed to be non-obvious in view of Garcia in view of Ahmed.

Similarly, the Applicant has amended Claim 16 to add limitations similar to Claim 1.

The Applicant therefore believes that new Claim 16 is non-obvious in view of Garcia in view of Ahmed.

The Applicant believes that claims 17-20 are non-obvious in view of Garcia in view of Ahmed since they are dependent from Claim 16 which is believed to be non-obvious in view of Garcia in view of Ahmed.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-20 is respectfully requested. It is believed that Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-20 are allowable over the prior art and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

GEOFFRION, Jean

By:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Alexandre Abecassis', written in dark ink.

Alexandre Abecassis (Reg. No. 58,883)  
Agent of Record

Tel.: (514) 397-4387

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 70096**